#5 5p



AMS 2 1 2003 2

Attorney Docket No. 047912/0133

Angus Fanar SYUKRI

Title:

E-MAIL SYSTEM AND INCOMING E-MAIL CHECK METHOD

Serial No.:

09/703,865

Filed:

November 2, 2000

Examiner:

Unknown

Art Unit:

2152

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.56 and 37 CFR §1.97

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith on Form PTO-SB/08 is a listing of documents known to Applicant in order to comply with Applicant's duty of disclosure pursuant to 37 CFR 1.56. A copy of each listed document is being submitted to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

The submission of any document herewith, which is not a statutory bar, is not intended as an admission that such document constitutes prior art against the claims of the present application or that such document is considered material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR §1.56(b). Applicant does not waive any rights to take any action which would be appropriate to antedate or otherwise remove as a competent reference any document which is determined to be a <u>prima facie</u> prior art reference against the claims of the present application.

Technology Center 2100

RECEIVED

AUG 2 2 2003

TIMING OF THE DISCLOSURE

The instant Information Disclosure Statement is believed to be filed in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.97(b), prior to the mailing date of a first Office Action on the merits (first scenario). If that is not the case, such as in a second scenario in which a first Office Action on the merits has been mailed before the filing of the instant Information Disclosure Statement, then either a certification or fee is required, and a certification is provided below. If neither of the first or second scenarios is the case, such as if a final Office Action or a notice of allowance has been mailed by the PTO (third scenario), then both a certification and fee are required, and in that case a certification is provided below and also the PTO is authorized to obtain the necessary fee to have the instant IDS considered, from Foley & Lardner Deposit Account #19-0741.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned hereby certifies in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.97(e)(1) that items of information A3 through A9 listed on the Form PTO SB/08 submitted with this Information Disclosure Statement were first cited in a communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application not more than three (3) months prior to the filing of this Statement. Item of information A1 is a U.S. Patent that is a counterpart to item of information A3, and item of information A2 is a U.S. Patent that is a counterpart to item of information A6.

RELEVANCE OF EACH DOCUMENT

A translation of a portion of a Japanese Office Action that issued July 8, 2003 with respect to a counterpart Japanese patent application is provided below.

"Cited Literature 1 through 3, Regarding Claims 1 and 9

Remarks

Efficient searching by reordering records according to frequency of use is nothing more than a well-known technology, such as described in Cited Literature 1 through 3, and no difficulties are seen in the application of said technology to the mail administration table of the mail server.

Cited Literature 1 through 4, Regarding Claims 2 through 5 and 10 through 13

Remarks

Cited Literature 4 describes "not answering incoming calls for a certain number of received call ring signals based on said received call, when there is no mail stored corresponding to the originating call telephone number received by the mail host."

Furthermore, clearly there is a specific relationship between the elapsed time of the received call and the number of received call ring signals, and there is nothing special recognized about using the elapsed time from dialing as the decision criterion.

Cited Literature 1 through 3, 5, and 6, Regarding Claims 6 and 14

Remarks

Cited Literature 5 and 6 describe the mail server not answering when no mail has been received, and so the "the dialing is not accepted for a number of dials less than a specific value" in the present application is not particularly different.

Furthermore, making a decision based on the multiple number of non-answers is seen as nothing more than a standard means for making the decision reliably.

Cited Literature 1 through 3, and 5, Regarding Claims 7, 8, 15, and 16

Remarks

Cited Literature 5 describes the use of an originator caller sub-address for the caller in ISDN.

A Notification of Reasons for Rejection will be provided if new reasons for rejection are discovered.

List of Cited Literature

Attorney Docket No. 047912/0133

Serial No. 09/703,865

Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H11-1. 345185

- Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H11-2. 238025
- 3. Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H05-022339
- Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H09-4. 219887
- Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H11-5. 046216
- 6. Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H11-252156

Record of Prior Art Literature Search Results Technical fields searched - IPC 7th Edition - H4L 12/58

Prior art literature

Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H11-112549 This Record of Prior Art Literature Search Results does not constitute the reason for rejection."

Applicant's statements regarding the Japanese Office Action are based on a partial translation that Applicant's representative obtained. statements should in no way be considered as an agreement by Applicant with, or an admission of, which is asserted in the Japanese Office Action.

Applicant respectfully request that the listed documents be considered by the Examiner and formally be made of record in the present application and that an initialed copy of Form-SB08 be returned in accordance with MPEP §609.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER Washington Harbour

3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500

Washington, D.C. 20007-5109

Facsimile:

Telephone: (202) 672-5300 (202) 672-5399

-4-